

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the instant application is respectfully requested. The present submission is responsive to the Final Office Action of September 13, 2005, in which claims 1-26 are presently pending. A courtesy copy of the claims is provided herein. Of those, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 11-13, 15-18, 20-23, 25 and 26 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0070394 by Gonzalez Ballester, et al., in view of Visser, et al. Claims 6, 7, 9 and 10 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Gonzalez Ballester, et al., in view of Visser, et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,577,888 to Chan, et al.

In addition, claims 3, 14, 19 and 24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonzalez Ballester, et al., in view of Visser, et al., and further in view of Jevtic. Finally, claim 8 is additionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Gonzalez Ballester, et al., in view of Visser, et al., in further view of Chan, et al., and further in view of Jevtic. For the following reasons, however, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

In the amendment filed on June 16, 2005, independent claims 1, 6, 11, 17 and 22 were amended to more particularly point out that the cylindrical tapering of the cylindrically tapered head portion 102 is such that the superior end of the head portion has a smaller diameter than the inferior end. However, in response, the Examiner has indicated on page 3 of the Final Office Action that "[w]ith reference to the superior end of the head portion having a small(er) diameter than the inferior end, Visser et al. teach the coils to be arranged according to the dimension of the body structure ([0031])."

Paragraph [0031] of Visser states:

"FIG. 2 shows a first embodiment of an RF coil system according to the invention. Two sets of RF coils, each set comprising two RF coils, are arranged around

the head 4 of a patient to be examined. In practice the user wishes to choose the ear to ear direction as the foldover direction for the head, because often the width of the head is smallest in this direction. The user has also reasons for choosing the foldover direction arbitrarily with a view to the signal-to-noise ratio (S/N ratio) and the direction of the desired slice to be imaged. Therefore, use is made of the two sets of coils as shown in FIG. 2, that is, one set of LR (=left/right) coils 5, 7 and one set of AP (=anterior/posterior) coils 6, 8. Furthermore, each RF coil 5, 6, 7, 8 is provided with a separate preamplifier 50, each of which defines a separate receiver channel C1, C2, C3, C4."

The Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in this paragraph teaches or suggests the claimed diameter configuration of the cylindrically tapered head portion. In the first place, paragraph [0031] is directed to describing the head coil arrangement of Figure 2 of Visser. As can be seen, this view along the longitudinal axis of the body reveals that the coils 5, 6, 7 and 8 are of equal diameters at superior and inferior ends thereof. Moreover, none of the other Figures of Visser specifically disclose the claimed diameter configuration.

With regard to head dimensions, Visser only states that the width of the head is often the smallest in the ear to ear direction. The Applicants submit that this recognition does not teach or suggest a head coil configuration in which the superior end of the head portion has a smaller diameter than the inferior end. Therefore, applying the Examiner's argument that Visser teaches the coils to be arranged according to the dimension of the body structure (in this case ear to ear direction representing the smallest head width), then according to Visser, the smallest diameter of the head coil would correspond to the ear to ear location, not the superior end of the coil.


Accordingly, the Applicants maintain the position that the claimed diameter configuration of the head coil portion is not taught or suggested in Visser or any of the other cited references of record. As such, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding §103 rejections.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. No new matter has been entered and no additional fees are believed to be required. However, if any fees are due with respect to this Amendment, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 07-0845 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,
EDDY BENJAMIN BOSKAMP, ET AL.

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicants' Attorneys

By



Sean F. Sullivan

Registration No. 38,328

Customer No. 23413

Date: November 14, 2005
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone: (860) 286-2929